

Derek W. Loeser (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
KELLER ROHRBACK L.L.P.  
1201 Third Avenue, Suite 3200  
Seattle, WA 98101  
Tel.: (206) 623-1900  
Fax: (206) 623-3384  
dloeser@kellerrohrback.com

Lesley E. Weaver (SBN 191305)  
BLEICHMAR FONTI & AULD LLP  
555 12th Street, Suite 1600  
Oakland, CA 94607  
Tel.: (415) 445-4003  
Fax: (415) 445-4020  
lweaver@bfalaw.com

*Plaintiffs' Co-Lead Counsel*

*[Additional counsel listed on signature page]*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

IN RE: FACEBOOK, INC. CONSUMER  
PRIVACY USER PROFILE LITIGATION

MDL No. 2843  
Case No. 18-md-02843-VC

This document relates to:

ALL ACTIONS

**PLAINTIFFS' RESPONSE TO NEW  
MEXICO'S MOTION TO INTERVENE**

Judge: Hon. Vince Chhabria  
Courtroom: 4, 17th Floor  
Hearing Date: March 2, 2023  
Hearing Time: 10:00 a.m.

The New Mexico Attorney General (“New Mexico”) asks to intervene to seek an order resolving whether the proposed settlement’s release may “inadvertently or otherwise release claims raised in the State’s parallel action” pending in New Mexico state court. Mot. to Intervene at 1, Feb. 28, 2023, ECF No. 1111.

Plaintiffs have no objection to New Mexico being heard on the issues it wishes to raise and note that this Court has the power to limit the scope of that intervention suitably. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 24, Notes of Advisory Comm. – 1966 Amend. (“An intervention of right under the amended rule may be subject to appropriate conditions or restrictions responsive among other things to the requirements of efficient conduct of the proceedings.”); *see also, e.g., WildEarth Guardians v. Jewell*, 320 F.R.D. 1, 5–6 (D.D.C. 2017) (putting limits on states’ intervention). Whether New Mexico’s desire to be heard requires formal intervention is an issue on which Plaintiffs take no position, but the Court could certainly hear from New Mexico without granting the Motion. *See Cotter v. Lyft, Inc.*, 193 F. Supp. 3d 1030, 1035 (N.D. Cal. 2016) (denying movants’ motion to intervene but permitting movants’ counsel to appear at the preliminary settlement approval hearing “to ensure a thorough assessment of the agreement’s fairness and adequacy”). Plaintiffs do, however, wish to flag two relevant considerations.

1. Insofar as New Mexico wants to intervene to get a *ruling* on how the release may affect its claims, this Court may not be the proper forum. The preclusive effect of a judgment is decided not by the forum that rendered the judgment, but by the forum presiding over the litigation that the judgment allegedly precludes. *See Ruiz v. Snohomish Cnty. Pub. Util. Dist. No. 1*, 824 F.3d 1161, 1168 (9th Cir. 2016) (“[T]o the extent that Defendants argue that the district court may predetermine the res judicata effect of its judgment, they are mistaken as a matter of law.”); *see also* Standing Order for Civil Cases Before Judge Vince Chhabria, ¶ 15. Thus, intervention may be unnecessary to protect New Mexico’s interests if another forum, not this one, must provide the ruling that New Mexico seeks.

2. Insofar as New Mexico wishes to be *heard* on how the settlement’s release provision may affect the Court’s preliminary or final approval of the settlement, it is not clear that

intervention is necessary. New Mexico may be heard on these matters both at the preliminary-approval hearing and at the final-approval stage. *See Noll v. eBay, Inc.*, 309 F.R.D. 593, 608 (N.D. Cal. 2015) (noting that state attorneys general may “raise any concerns” about a proposed settlement “during the normal course of the class action settlement procedures” (citation and quotation omitted)).

Dated: March 1, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

KELLER ROHRBACK L.L.P.

BLEICHMAR FONTI & AULD LLP

By: /s/ Derek W. Loeser  
Derek W. Loeser

By: /s/ Lesley E. Weaver  
Lesley E. Weaver

Derek W. Loeser (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Cari Campen Laufenberg (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
David Ko (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Adele A. Daniel (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Benjamin Gould (SBN 250630)  
Emma M. Wright (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Daniel Mensher (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Michael Woerner (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Matthew Gerend (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
1201 Third Avenue, Suite 3200  
Seattle, WA 98101  
Tel.: (206) 623-1900  
Fax: (206) 623-3384  
dloeser@kellerrohrback.com  
claufenberg@kellerrohrback.com  
dko@kellerrohrback.com  
adaniel@kellerrohrback.com  
bgould@kellerrohrback.com  
ewright@kellerrohrback.com  
dmensher@kellerrohrback.com  
mwoerner@kellerrohrback.com  
mgerend@kellerrohrback.com

Lesley E. Weaver (SBN 191305)  
Anne K. Davis (SBN 267909)  
Matthew S. Melamed (SBN 260272)  
Angelica M. Ornelas (SBN 285929)  
Joshua D. Samra (SBN 313050)  
555 12th Street, Suite 1600  
Oakland, CA 94607  
Tel.: (415) 445-4003  
Fax: (415) 445-4020  
lweaver@bfalaw.com  
adavis@bfalaw.com  
mmelamed@bfalaw.com  
aornelas@bfalaw.com  
jsamra@bfalaw.com

Christopher Springer (SBN 291180)  
801 Garden Street, Suite 301  
Santa Barbara, CA 93101  
Tel.: (805) 456-1496  
Fax: (805) 456-1497  
cspringer@kellerrohrback.com

Eric Fierro (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
3101 North Central Avenue, Suite 1400  
Phoenix, AZ 85012  
Tel: (602) 248-0088  
Fax: (602) 248-2822  
efierro@kellerrohrback.com

*Plaintiffs' Co-Lead Counsel*

**ATTESTATION PURSUANT TO CIVIL LOCAL RULE 5-1(h)(3)**

I, Lesley E. Weaver, attest that concurrence in the filing of this document has been obtained from the other signatory. I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed this 1st day of March, 2023, at Oakland, California.

/s/ Lesley E. Weaver

Lesley E. Weaver

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I, Julie Law, hereby certify that on March 1, 2023, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the United States District Court for the Northern District of California using the CM/ECF system, which shall send electronic notification to all counsel of record.

/s/ Julie Law

Julie Law